DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 231 CS 210 618

AUTHOR Eveslage, Thomas
TITLE Teaching Free Speech Values to High School Students: Keys to Persevering Despite the Obstacles.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (70th, San Antonio, TX, August 1-4, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Education; *Critical Thinking; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Research; English Curriculum; *Freedom of Speech; High Schools; Journalism Education; Social Studies; Theory Practice Relationship; Values Education

ABSTRACT

To examine why citizens today do not understand the U.S. Constitution and its provisions, a survey was conducted among 153 high school social studies, journalism, and English teachers to examine, among other things, how they taught about constitutional rights and how they rated their students' knowledge of the subject compared to students' knowledge 5 to 10 years ago, and how they felt their beliefs about constitutional rights compared with those of national professional organizations, students, administrators, and parents. Results showed that most teachers used a textbook to teach about constitutional rights, most were dissatisfied with it, but many were willing to use supplemental materials for the unit. Most teachers indicated that their students today rated higher in their support for traditional American institutions but lower in their understanding of them. Students' critical thinking skills were rated lower than those of students 5 to 10 years ago by 47.9% of the teachers surveyed. Most teachers, particularly journalism teachers, felt their beliefs about constitutional rights differed from those of students, administrators, and parents, but came closer to agreeing with the beliefs of national professional organizations. To ensure understanding and tolerant citizens, treatment of the First Amendment in textbooks must be improved, supplemental materials concerning constitutional rights must be made available to teachers, and more time must be spent on the subject in the classroom. (JC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED284231

Teaching Free Speech Values to High School Students:

Keys to Persevering Despite the Obstacles

by

Thomas Eveslage
Associate Professor
Department of Journalism
Temple University

A research paper presented to the Secondary Education Division during the August 1987 Annual Convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas Eveslage

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS210618

Teaching Free Speech Values to High School Students:
Keys to Persevering Despite the Obstacles

Throughout this bicentennial year of the U.S. Constitution, attention has focused on ways to increase public appreciation of this cornerstone of our country. In the process, news reports have with increasing frequency pointed out not a lack of appreciation but an alarming lack of understanding of the Constitution and its provisions.

These findings are neither new nor surprising to free speech proponents. A Gallup Poll in 1980 showed that three of every four Americans did not know what the First Amendment is or what it concerns.[1] More recently, a 1986 Hearst Corporation survey revealed that most adults do not know the content or purpose of the Constitution[2] and show "apparent indifference" to freedom of the press.[3]

The media's efforts to increase understanding of free speech/press principles has continued, from the First Amendment Congress's first meeting in 1980 through the Society of Professional Journalists, Sigma Delta Chi's Project Watchdog in 1984 to the Advertising Council's 1987 multimedia national ad camgaign.[4] These efforts have been extended to reach teachers and students. The ANPA Foundation, the bicentennial commission and 12 national education organizations are co-sponsors of a September 16 teach-in on the eve of this year's anniversary of the signing of the Constitution.[5]

The need to increase knowledge and appreciation of free speech among the young is the reason for the study described in this paper.

The goal is to better understand why our citizens believe as they do about the First Amendment. One way to reach that goal is to learn how young people are taught free speech concepts.

Americans entrust some 40 million young people to this nation's 87,000 public schools. Three million of these students graduate each year.[6] These new adults, we are told, will join a society where fewer Americans take the political process seriously and large numbers refuse to participate as citizens.[7] And they come from the ranks of high school students said to be less likely to challenge tradition, less concerned with social injustice and more interested in preserving the status quo than students a decade earlier.[8]

The specific focus of this paper will be a group of high school teachers who do teach free speech/press concepts. Can we characterize the school environment most conducive to teaching freedom of expression? What can we learn from these teachers that will improve future efforts to educate productive citizens and intelligent media consumers?

Parameters of the Study

This study does not deal with a representative cross-section of high school teachers. As explained in the Methods section below, the study respondents have passed through three screening steps. The result is a sample of teachers assumed to be very interested in the teaching of free speech.

Several other assumptions underlie this study:

1. The more knowledgeable that students are in citizenship, the more pro-democratic and supportive of free speech concepts they will be.[9] A corollary of this is that adults who do not understand

free speech and free press concepts probably were not solidly grounded in it when they were young.

2. It is simplistic to believe that merely telling teachers more about free speech principles will sufficiently encourage them to include those concepts in their teaching. Better understanding of the classroom environment, curriculum pressures and teacher attitudes is needed to better understand how to reach students.
3. This study concerns high school teachers. No single factor, however, provides the key to understanding how to reach teachers and students in this country's 16,000 public high schools. Many personal and environmental factors beyond the scope of this study may be every bit as important as those cited here.

What Can We Expect?

The literature indicates several factors that may affect the way free speech concepts are taught. The concern here is with insight to personnel, curricular and environmental characteristics.

Little research exists to suggest that teaching experience or size of school will influence the way teachers approach this subject. The broader topics of the Constitution, Bill of Rights and citizenship are common to virtually all school curricula, and personal interest, rather than years of experience, may influence the extent to which these subjects are refined and free speech stressed.

One might expect that the topic is dealt with differently in social studies classrooms than in journalism or publications courses. Most studies concern social studies classes, with no comparable study of journalism classes available for comparison. One study found that most journalism teachers who responded to a query

on press law in the curriculum were more experienced than the average journalism teacher and had taught a free press unit before.[10]

Student Attitudes and Beliefs

Evidence abounds that high school students have difficulty grappling with free speech concepts. Sigel found that high school seniors had a great deal of difficulty explaining democracy[11] and Jones reported a decrease between 1969 and 1975 in knowledge of democratic principles and interest in political activity.[12] The National Assessment of Educational Progress in 1983 cited improvement between 1976 and 1982 in students' knowledge of their government and the political process, but found no progress in respect for the rights of others.[13]

Johnston and Bachman reported a good deal of ambivalence in 1975 among high school seniors in their support for others who sign petitions or join boycotts. Almost one in four had little or no interest in government.[14] Elam compared the attitudes of seniors in 1984 with those in 1952. He found today's youth more supportive of freedoms of speech and assembly, but also more uncertain about the meaning of those traditional freedoms.[15]

The Classroom Environment

Time Spent: It is risky to distinguish the classroom environment from the teacher who resides there, but several studies have referred to the amount of class time spent on free speech and the grade level for such instruction. Eveslage found that of those journalism teachers who spent time with free press issues, 43% devoted one week or less, 70% no more than two weeks and 87% three weeks or less.[16] Ehman, after a three-year study of high school

sophomores, concluded that students who believed that they dealt regularly with controversial issues in the classroom showed increased political interest and activity.[17] Remy and Wagstaff cited the relationship between time spent on a topic and student achievement. They noted evidence that sufficient teaching time is necessary for good citizenship education.[18]

Grade Level: Herman reported the recommendations of social studies educators asked to determine the grade levels for a variety of content, including citizenship and legal education. Under citizenship, most respondents felt that the use of decision-making skills should be stressed in grades 7-9, while understanding of the social, economic and political systems and processes should be stressed in grades 10-12. Analysis and evaluation of government, politics and citizenship should occur throughout grades 7-12. Democratic principles should be taught in grades 7-9, but the Bill of Rights and the responsibilities of citizenship throughout high school.[19] A National Council for the Social Studies Task Force was more specific. It suggested that freedom of expression be dealt with beginning in grade 8, freedom of thought in grade 10 and value conflicts and citizenship issues in grade 12.[20]

Length of Course: Little evidence exists that treatment of this topic is tied to whether the course in which free speech is taught runs for a full year, a semester or a quarter. In fact, Hunkins, et. al. concluded that the number of social studies courses taken by students has little or no relationship to students' political attitudes.[21]

Course Content and Presentation

Goals and Objectives: Teachers are told early in their training that course objectives are important. Lesson plans should have objectives, as should a curriculum. The literature suggests that teachers have less difficulty defining common goals in citizenship training than achieving those goals. The task in training young adults was implied in a study by Zellman and Sears, who found that students in grades 5-9 were not learning the principle of free expression because it was taught only as a slogan and not as it applies to concrete situations.[22]

Teachers have been found to equate "good citizenship" with obedience,[23] moral outcomes and compliance.[24] When a 1951 study of student attitudes toward constitutional freedoms revealed that seniors who had studied civics agreed with the Bill of Rights less often than those who had not studied civics, researchers concluded that there may have been too much classroom emphasis on the mechanics of government instead of on the values of democracy.[25]

"Values" have become common objectives. Various publications of the National Council for the Social Studies identify one or more of the following: justice, equality, responsibility, freedom, diversity, privacy. human dignity, rule of law, human rights, honesty and equality.[26] Advocates of values education urge teachers to go beyond talking about values or just presenting facts. Student actions should be discussed and action projects planned, with the focus on student behavior.[27]

Before turning to specific teaching techniques, a word of caution from John Goodlad about the bridge from course objective to classroom content:

> "[C]oncepts or skills calling for development over relatively long periods of time, which often appear in curriculum guides prepared rather distantly from the classroom, show up relatively infrequently as one gets closer to and inside the classroom, then almost completely disappear when one looks at what is called for in quizzes and tests....In other words, the goal of learning a fundamental concept or principle is sacrificed to the means which, in turn, becomes the goal emphasized in teaching and learning and then called for in tests."[28]

Teaching Techniques: The NCSS Task Force urges teachers to introduce concepts, skills and values in concrete and simple terms, reinforcing and applying them until students are able to apply abstract concepts while analyzing events. This requires classroom procedures with direct student involvement and learning activities that reach into the community.[29]

Methods such as exposition, recitation, discussion, role-playing, discovery and community involvement have been encouraged.[30] But adolescents, no more willing than adults to go beyond giving lip service to democratic values, are reluctant to apply abstract values to specific examples. Goldenson examined the use of controversial topics to study the implications of abstract constitutional principles in concrete situations. He found that among high school seniors, those who dealt with the controversial topics during a three-week civil liberties unit showed significantly more positive attitude change regarding civil liberties.[31] Grossman found that tolerance of dissent was more prevalent among tenth and twelfth graders who felt free to express their views in class and who had taken more courses where controversial issues were discussed.[32]

Authorities often cite the powerful influence that the school and classroom environments play in both teaching and learning

beliefs and values. Young people most supportive of democratic principles have been found to have investigated issues in an open classroom environment where inquiry is encouraged.[33] Such openness has been linked to more knowledgeable, less authoritarian and more interested students. Positive student political attitudes and behavior is most prevalent in schools high in student participation and low in authoritarianism.[34]

Goodlad's earlier admonition regarding the gap between written principles and classroom procedures bears repeating here. He bemoaned the "extraordinary sameness in the ways of teaching" and the obstacles facing a teacher who wants to innovate in the face of established practice.[35] This becomes particularly critical in the teaching of free speech concepts. Some of the all-too-familiar classroom techniques--use of printed drill materials, emphasis on factual content and repetition of patriotic rituals--have been linked to the authoritarianism that makes it harder to teach democratic principles.[36]

Classroom Resources: Little research has examined the extent to which classroom materials--textbooks in particular--are linked to success or failure in teaching constitutional concepts. But several scholars have suggested that problems arise from the use of the textbooks now available.

Remy and Wagstaff cited a national survey commissioned by the National Science Foundation. Ninety percent of social studies teachers relied on textbooks as the primary instructional tool, the NSF study found.[37] To compound the problem, one in four teachers complained of outdated teaching materials in classroom texts, but

only a fraction of that number were aware of other or more recent materials that could be used as alternatives.[38]

A Project '87 textbook study noted as well that textbooks devote a relatively small proportion of their content to constitutional topics. In addition, the Constitution is usually treated in a narrow, literal, simplified way that only describes briefly the document's origins and structure. As Patrick and Remy observe, "Students who rely on these textbooks have little opportunity to know how the Constitution affects the lives of citizens."[39]

Dissatisfaction with current textbooks dealing with freedom of the press was found among high school journalism teachers, too. Almost half of the journalism teachers responding to a survey in 1981 said they used no text in teaching a unit on press freedom. More than half of the respondents said they used guests or periodicals, however, and many used films, pamphlets and videotapes.[40]

There is some evidence of a desire to use supplementary materials. Gilliom et. al. noted the "talent bank" of community people who are well prepared to provide citizenship training.[41] Other scholars have said that audio-visual materials and other printed matter should be used in conjunction with a good textbook. But a recent study by Turner revealed a dearth of supplementary resources that could compensate for the weaknesses in textbooks.[42]

Summary

The literature clearly offers more insight to the social studies classroom than to the journalism class. Research relevant to teaching free speech values can be applied to either setting, however. Discussion of such elements as teaching technique, sup-

plemental materials, classroom environment and student attitudes can be as meaningful to either journalism or social studies teachers.

No research was found, however, that would help predict the behavior of the strongly motivated teachers central to this study. As the next section explains, the teachers examined here do not easily fall into the category of "typical" journalism or social studies teacher. But it still will be useful to examine their beliefs and behavior within the educational context outlined in the literature.

Method

A 1981 survey by the author led to development and publication of a high school curriculum guide on free speech and free press and a Gannett Foundation grant to help examine how free speech is taught in the schools. Those who bought the guide also received a two-page User Questionnaire and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. This questionnaire asked those who ordered to provide demographic information and indicate what attracted them to the resource. Of those who responded, high school teachers were identified and sent a second questionnaire six to nine months after their earlier response. A follow-up was sent to those who did not respond to the second questionnaire. The respondents to questionnaire #2 provide the sample for this study.

Of the 258 teachers who responded to the first and were sent the second, 153 completed the four-page second questionnaire, a response rate of 59.3 percent. It must be stressed that although the sample size is small, respondents represent a group thought to be very interested in and involved with teaching about free speech. Each respondent took the initiative three times: to order and pay

for the book, to return the first questionnaire and to return the second questionnaire. This study does not include comparisons between this group's responses and those of teachers who took none of these steps, nor does it examine in detail the impact of the First Amendment curriculum guide on classroom behavior. The focus here instead is on the beliefs and teaching practices of high school teachers assumed to be committed to instruction on free speech and free press concepts.

Findings

Demographic Profile

Most respondents had one of three primary teaching assignments: social studies (33.1%), journalism/publications (21.9%) or English/language arts (30.5%). Most were experienced teachers: 25% had 1-9 years of teaching, 23% 10-14 years, 24% 15-18 years and 28% had more than 19 years of experience. Social studies teachers tended to be more experienced, those teaching primarily journalism were less experienced and English/languge arts teachers were fairly well distributed throughout the range (X^2=18.21; $p<.006$). Fifty-one percent of the respondents had taught about free speech for at least eight years; just 20% had spent two years or less teaching the subject.

Half of the respondents were in schools with a model curriculum that dealt with free speech and press. Only 4 of the 77 respondents who reported a model curriculum said that it came from outside of the school (i.e., the state department of education), and just 52% of those with a curriculum said they were required to follow it.

Most of the respondents (62.4%) came from schools with more than 1,000 students and 30.9% taught in schools of 1,500 or more students. School size was inconsequential in analyzing much of the descriptive data. Just five of the teachers with primary assignments in journalism came from schools of fewer than 1,000 students, but enrollment was not a factor in determining whether a school had a model curriculum or what the model curriculum included.

Attitudes and Beliefs

Teachers were asked to assess the extent that their beliefs and attitudes on the value of teaching free expression was similar to the feelings of five groups: state or national professional groups, school administrators, other faculty, students, and parents or the community. Respondents also were asked to compare today's students with those of 5-10 years ago in each of five issue categories. Teachers' responses to these were analyzed and compared with course goals and objectives.

With few exceptions, the respondents' demographic characteristics provided less insight than the pattern of responses from this group of free expression proponents. Table 1 [see page 27] shows that respondents in general believe that their feelings about the value of free speech instruction are much closer to the sentiments of state or national professional groups than to any group within the school. One in four teachers thinks his or her beliefs are different from other faculty members.

More specifically, journalism teachers (69%) were most likely to classify their beliefs as "very similar" to these external groups, compared with 38% of social studies and 34% of English

teachers. More social studies (55.5%) and English teachers (41%) classified their beliefs as very similar or somewhat similar to school administrators than do journalism teachers (37%). Journalism teachers also were the group most likely to rate their beliefs out of sync with the beliefs of their fellow teachers. All journalism teachers were less likely (22%) to be unsure of whether their attitudes coincided with the administration.

Teachers in all three disciplines consider their beliefs to be similar to those of their students. In this area, 66% of the social studies teachers, 67% of the journalism and 63% of the English teachers said their views on teaching this topic coincided with their students'. The same agreement exists in terms of parent/community support, although a majority (55.6%) said they were not sure how these outside groups feel on this issue.

Table 2 [see page 27] reveals how teachers feel students today compare with those of 5-10 years ago regarding the understanding of responsible citizenship, awareness of free speech issues, appreciation of societal values, support for American institutions and critical thinking. Respondents scored today's students highest for support of American institutions and lowest in the area of critical thinking.

Support of institutions is the only category in which the teachers graded this year's students higher than those of 5-10 years ago. More than one in three of the sample believes students have less awareness of what it means to be a responsible citizen and four in ten teachers rated students lower in appreciation of societal values and awareness of free speech. Social studies teachers rated

students significantly higher in free speech awareness than did English or journalism teachers (X^2=22.78;p<.004) and gave students higher marks in support for American institutions. All three groups graded students low in critical thinking; 11.4% of the respondents scored students "much lower" than students of 5-10 years ago. More than teachers in any other experience category, those teaching five years or less also were more likely to score students high in support for American institutions and low in critical thinking skills.

The Classroom Environment

Model Curriculum: Survey findings suggest that free speech/press is much more likely to be part of a a social studies model curriculum than one used by an English or journalism teacher (X^2=24.15;p<.0000). Seventy-eight percent of the social studies teachers said that they were guided by a model curriculum, compared with just 34.2% of the English/language arts/journalism teachers. But when crosstabs were run, the presence of a model curriculum in the school seemed not to be a significant factor in classroom decisions made by the teachers in this study.

Course Description: Respondents provided a profile of the 86 year-long courses, 55 semester courses and six quarter courses in which free speech/free press was taught. Sixty-one percent of these were social studies courses, 19% journalism, 16% English and 4% were not identifiable by department. Most of the courses enrolled seniors or juniors: 82 were open to seniors, 65 to juniors, 32 to sophomores, 16 to freshmen and 2 to seventh and eighth graders.

Probably the most interesting and consistent finding in the data is the extent to which respondents found textbook treatment of

this topic inadequate (56.4% of those who taught year-long courses and 53.2% of those teaching semester courses).

Among teachers of full-year courses, 47.7% used model curricula and 89.5% had a textbook available on this topic. Twenty-one of the full-year courses were in English, 5 in journalism, 22 in advanced journalism, 9 in publications, 48 in social studies, 12 in political science, 17 in civics and 9 in economics. Most teachers of English, journalism, publications, political science, civics and economics devoted 5-9 days to discussion of free speech. Year-long courses in advanced journalism and social studies were more likely to devote 10-14 days to the topic. Almost half of the teachers spent more time on free speech/free press during the past year than previously; 68.3% spent an additional 2-5 days.

The profile of semester courses is just slightly different. Fewer teachers of these courses (54.5%) had a model curriculum or a textbook on free speech/free press (88.9%). Seventeen of the semester courses were in English, 3 in journalism, 9 in advanced journalism, 3 in publications, 31 in social studies, 6 in political science, 8 in civics and 5 in economics. One would expect that fewer class periods were spent on free speech/free press in semester journalism courses than in year-long courses, and that was true generally. But interestingly, while semester journalism and publications classes devoted less time to the topic (1-4 class periods), semester social science courses often devoted proportionately <u>more</u> time to the topic (10-15 class periods in 10 social studies classes and 5-9 days in most political science, civics and economics courses). This could be due to the more spe-

cialized nature of semester courses within the social sciences, specialization less likely in semester journalism courses.

Time Spent on Free Speech: Slightly more than half (55%) of the journalism and English teachers said they spent more time on free speech/free press during the previous year, but just (35%) of the social studies teachers did. Of those who spent more time, 9% devoted one additional day, 63.7% said 2-5 days and 27.3% gave five or more extra days to the topic.

Teachers also were asked to identify the important factors in determining how much time they spend on free speech and free press. Respondents in all three disciplines agreed that course content limitations posed the major problem. This was cited as important by 78.9% of all teachers and 85.4% of the social studies teachers. As a positive influence, personal interest was said to be "very important" to 61.3% of the respondents and "important" to the other 38.7%. Closely behind was student interest, which 90.2% of the teachers said was important.

Department requirements (40.4%), school district requirements (38.8%) and state requirements (36.4%) were less often cited as important determinants. However, more than 55% of the social studies teachers said these three factors were important.

Course Content and Presentation

Goals and Objectives: In an attempt to determine where teachers are likely to place their priorities in teaching free speech and free press, they were asked to rate the importance of eight goals or course objectives. Because of the respondents' inherent interest in the topic, this question did not by itself reveal

many surprises. Two statistically significant findings emerged. One showed that more journalism teachers (93.8%) than English (71.4%) or social studies teachers (70.2%) consider an increased awareness of the First Amendment "very important" ($X^2=6.99;p<.03$). Social studies (72.9%) and English teachers (70.7%) both are more likely than journalism teachers (50%) to believe it is very important to relate the Constitution to students' lives ($X^2=9.93;p<.05$).

As Table 3 [see page 28] shows, most teachers rated highest the goal of encouraging critical thinking (82% said "very important"), and near the bottom the goal of strenthening American institutions (40.8% said "very important"). This is consistent with the teachers' assessment of today's students (see Table 2, discussed earlier).

Further insight comes from examining teachers' assessment of their beliefs (Table 1) and their course goals (Table 3). The survey revealed that teachers who considered their beliefs to be very similar to those of national professional organizations were also more likely to believe that the goal of encouraging critical thinking is very important ($X^2=4.75;p<.1$), as is the goal of increasing awareness of the First Amendment ($X^2=7.34;p<.03$).

In terms of comparing their views with those of school administrators, respondents who perceived their views to be <u>different</u> from their superiors were more likely to believe that today's students are somewhat lower in critical thinking skills than students 5-10 years ago. And respondents similar in belief to school administrators were much more likely to believe it very important to teach students responsible citizenship ($X^2=8.31;p<.02$).

Respondents with beliefs very similar to those of other faculty were more likely to believe it very important to set goals of encouraging critical thinking (X^2=8.13;p<.02), preserving societal values (X^2=9.49;p<.05), encouraging individual expression (X^2=10.95;p<.03), strenthening American institutions (X^2=10.26;p<.04) and providing historical context (X^2=9.52;p<.05). It should be noted, however, that just one survey respondent in five said his or her beliefs were very similar to those of other faculty.

Teachers who perceived their beliefs to be very similar to their students' also were more likely to consider very important the goal of encouraging critical thinking (X^2=8.11;p<.02). Those who said that students' critical thinking skills lag behind those of previous students also were more likely to consider it very important that a course goal be to strenthen American institutions (X^2=11.18;p<.03). This goal also was very important to teachers who believe that students' understanding of responsible citizenry is somewhat lower than 5-10 years ago (X^2=14.58;p<.006).

Teaching Techniques: Traditional teaching methods of lecture and discussion are popular among the respondents in this survey, but a good number indicated at least occasional use of other techniques. Eight in ten teachers said they lectured always or often; 97% said they used classroom discussions. Guest speakers were used often by 38.7% of the teachers, role-playing by 39.6%, class projects by 63.7% and films or tapes by 60.1%. The profiles of year-long, semester and quarter courses reveal similar patterns, suggesting that the teacher or topic, not the particular course, is more likely to influence the choice of teaching techniques.

Classroom Resources: One final category of teacher responses offers a revealing glimpse into the classroom where free expression is taught. Teachers were asked to check from a list of eight those free-speech related sources of information available to them, and then to rate the usefulness of each resource. Listed were textbooks, other books/pamphlets, college coursework, other teachers, professional meetings, school in-service days, professional journals and Newspaper-in-Education programs.

Although textbooks got generally low reviews from the teachers in this survey, a qualifier is in order. The fact that the entire sample in this study consisted of teachers who had sought and purchased a curriculum guide on free speech and free press suggests that respondents would have some dissatisfaction with the way other classroom materials treat the subject. On the other hand, the fact that these teachers sought additional material implies that the respondents are more imaginative and resourceful than the average teacher described in the literature.

Significantly more social studies than English/journalism teachers in the study had a textbook on free speech and free press available ($X^2=4.27; p<.04$) and found their textbook useful in teaching this subject ($X^2=9.42; p<.052$). Although 87.2% of the sample had access to a text, just 29.8% considered the book "very useful." Four of five teachers said that other books were available to them, including 87.8% of the social studies teachers.

Just three in five teachers said that college coursework on this topic was available to them, although significantly more social studies (72.3%) than English (43.2%) teachers said so

($X^2=8.60;p<.02$). English and journalism teachers also less often cited other teachers as available or useful sources of information.

The three groups of teachers differed significantly in their acknowledgement that professional meetings were available ($X^2=10.21;p<.007$). Just 45.5% of all teachers cited this source, but 62.5% of the journalism teachers did, compared to 27.3% of English teachers and 51.1% of social studies teachers. Just as with professional meetings, journalism teachers (81.3%) led the way in citing professional journals available to them on this topic, followed by social studies (75%) and English teachers (65.9%). And a vast majority of the respondents--including 96% of the journalism, 93% of the English and 87% of the social studies teachers who used them--found such journals useful.

Another source judged quite helpful by the teachers who used it, but more often than not believed unavailable to them, is the Newspaper-in-Education program. Just 31.3% of the journalism teachers, 45.5% in English and 58.3% in social studies reported NIE materials to be available ($X^2=5.70;p<.06$). Of those who used these resources, 90% of social studies teachers, 80% in journalism and 77% in English considered them useful in teaching about free speech/free press. In addition, teachers with at least 15 years of experience were more than twice as likely to be aware of available NIE materials than were teachers with 2-9 years of experience.

In-service days, available to just 22% of the teachers, were generally considered of little value. That was the verdict of 75% of the social studies, 81% of the journalism and 66% of the English teachers surveyed.

Nine of ten teachers also said they supplemented their textbook with other material: news articles (26%), periodical articles (22.2%), material from professional organizations (16.2%), audio-visual materials (20.4%), pamphlets (13%), a curriculum guide (24.2%), case studies (6.1%), other texts (18.4%) and other library materials (5.2%). Of the 52.1% who said they had used guest speakers, journalists headed the list (60.8%), followed by lawyers (52.6%), other teachers (16.2%), civic leaders (17.6%) and community representatives (10.8%).

Finally, teachers were asked if they had used material from The First Amendment: Free Speech and a Free Press, the curriculum guide that each had ordered; 81.1% said that they had and 18.9% said that they had not. More journalism (93.5%) than English (80%) or social studies (73.9%) had used the work.

Of those who used the guide, 15.8% said it had no effect on how they taught their courses. The influence most often cited was additional time devoted to the topic; 60.4% said they spent more time on free speech/free press (74.3% of English, 58.6% of journalism and 48.6% of social studies teachers). Teachers with fewer than 14 years of experience also were much more likely to spend additional time than those beyond the median age of respondents ($X^2=4.88; p<.03$).

More social studies teachers (40.5%) than journalism (31%) or English teachers (37%) said that the guide led them to cover new material, an influence cited by 35.6% of all respondents who used the book. Social studies teachers (40.5%) also were most likely to

say they used different classroom activities because of the curriculum guide.

Summary

Examples abound that today's citizens--adults and children alike--do not understand the U.S. Constitution and its provisions. Part of the problem lies with how we learn about the Constitution and what we are taught. This study tried to shed some light on that process and to identify what should and is being done by teachers interested in teaching about free speech and free press.

This paper examined a sample of 153 high school teachers interested enough in this subject to order a curriculum guide and return two questionnaires. The results, although not generalizable to all high school teachers of free speech, tell us something about those educators who are likely devoting more than the average amount of classroom time and attention to this subject.

In this study, teachers looking for others who shared their beliefs identified more with groups outside of the school. It is particularly distressing that relatively few teachers of free speech consider their views on the topic to be similar to those of their students, other teachers or school administrators. This apparent isolation--more noticeable among journalism teachers than among English or social studies teachers with colleagues in the school--has these teachers turning to professional organizations and professional journals for guidance and support.

A degree of cynicism emerged as well when teachers were asked to compare today's students with those of 5-10 years ago. In all but one category--support for American institutions--teachers said

that today's students scored lower than the earlier group. This was particularly true of students' critical thinking skills, rated lower by 47.9% of the teachers surveyed.

One cannot be sure how much the low assessment reflects the students' educational experience or other influences on students' lives. But teachers in the survey revealed through their classroom goals an eagerness to improve the perceived shortcomings. Many of those surveyed seemed to believe that the school environment discouraged critical thinking and encouraged support of American institutions.

Teachers who rated today's students low in critical thinking said that their beliefs were quite different from those of their school administrators. These teachers also were most likely to compare their beliefs to those of state and national organizations and to stress the teaching of critical thinking.

As for their courses, 90% of the teachers surveyed used a textbook--a figure comparable to the national average. More time on the topic was set aside in social studies courses, especially those a semester long, but 5-9 days was the average amount of time spent regardless of the length of the course. The major limitation to spending more time was the pressure to cover so much other material (most often cited by social studies teachers). And, to the surprise of few teachers, respondents listed personal interest and student interest in the topic as major factors in their spending more time on the subject.

More than 80% of the respondents said they relied on the traditional classroom teaching tools of lecture and discussion, but the

use of alternative strategies and supplementary resources, encouraged by scholars in previous studies, also was apparent. Teachers frequently mentioned the use of guests, projects, role-playing and other external resources. And the use of these alternatives was not related to whether the course lasted a full year, a semester or a quarter.

Most teachers had a textbook, used it and complained about it. That may be one reason so many of those surveyed went to outside resources and activities. Journalism teachers used professional meetings and journals more than either of the other groups did. Another reflection of the school environment and interest of other faculty and administrators may be the low rating teachers gave to in-service days. Whether it was because too few teachers in the school were perceived to be interested or helped by such a program, in-service days received low grades from respondents in terms of both availability and usefulness.

Conclusion

What does this profile tell us? It obviously offers just the shadow of a problem worthy of much more investigation. And it raises several unanswered questions. What specifically can we do to improve the number and quality of young, productive citizens supportive of free speech/free press values? Who can help, and how? Where do we go next, in terms of research, direct involvement and programs?

A closer look at the specific classroom treatment of the topic is needed, as is an examination of free speech values among students in courses taught by interested teachers like those in this study.

Another useful corollary to this study would be a comparison with teachers who do not share such an interest in the topic, and the values those students develop.

We know from looking at the respondents in this survey that there continues to be dissatisfaction with the classroom textbooks that so many teachers must use. (The author's examination of two recently published social studies textbooks revealed woefully shallow, even misleading treatment of the First Amendment, free speech and free press.) A content analysis would be valuable, as would a closer examination of textbook use and satisfaction among teachers less dedicated to free speech issues.

It is obvious from this study that more work must be done to get free speech values not just into the textbooks, but into the curriculum as well. Those teachers who say they spend little time with this topic indicate that there is too much other mandated material to cover. It seems one answer is to see that First Amendment issues become an essentioal part of the school curriculum.

If those who were part of this study represent the better informed and more interested proponents of teaching free speech and free press, more attention must be given to the new and inexperienced teacher. Those in colleges and universities preparing teachers should be persuaded that effective citizenship training must include teaching of free speech and free press concepts. This may be a critical step if, as the survey suggests, teachers must look outside of the school for support, ideas and resources. Young teachers most often use the skills and knowledge they bring from their college training, and when that fails they turn to their

readily available school colleagues for support and reinforcement. If these young teachers come to their jobs disposed to treat free speech issues, they will more quickly seek and use the outside stimulants that the more interested and experienced teachers in this study found necessary.

As those conducting earlier research have said, more supplementary material on this subject is needed. And, as this study suggests, groups such as AEJMC, the Journalism Education Association, the National Council for the Social Studies, the National Council of the Teachers of English and ANPA's Newspaper-in-Education must accelerate their efforts to reach these teachers through their conventions, their publications and the work of their members.

Those who have conducted research on or are teaching the development of free speech/free press values have an important role to play. It is their writing in professional journals, their speeches at conventions, their workshops that nurture the interest of teachers who feel isolated in their schools. The support network that appears to be so important is at the same time quite tenuous.

We still are a long way from a society of tolerant, understanding citizens sensitive to the true value of free and open expression. An educated public will support free speech and a free press. That education must begin with interested, informed teachers working hard and effectively with today's young citizens.

TABLE 1

Similarity of Teachers' Beliefs and Other Groups' Beliefs Regarding the Value of Teaching Free Speech/Free Press

Respondents' beliefs are	very similar to	somewhat similar to	different from
State or national professional groups	59.4%	35.8%	4.7%
School administrators	25.8%	44.3%	29.9%
Other faculty	19.8%	54.9%	25.3%
Students	26.7%	64.4%	8.9%
Parents or community	16.7%	63.6%	19.7%

TABLE 2

Comparison of Today's Students With Those of 5-10 Years Ago

Today's students rate	higher	about the same	lower
Understanding of responsible citizenship	22.1%	41.4%	36.6%
Awareness of free speech issues	29.3%	28.6%	42.2%
Appreciation of societal values	20.0%	39.3%	40.7%
Support for American institutions	37.0%	33.6%	29.5%
Critical thinking	15.8%	36.3%	47.9%

TABLE 3

Teachers' Assessment of Goals or Course Objectives
When Teaching About the First Amendment and Free Speech/Press

Goals or Objectives rated	very important	somewhat important	not important
Teach responsible citizenship	75.0%	24.3%	.7%
Encourage critical thinking	82.0%	18.0%	----
Increase First Amendment awareness	74.8%	25.2%	----
Preserve societal values	46.0%	46.8%	7.3%
Encourage individual expression	61.6%	35.5%	2.9%
Strengthen American institutions	40.8%	52.0%	7.2%
Relate the Constitution to students' lives	64.2%	32.8%	2.9%
Provide historical context	38.7%	58.3%	8.0%

ENDNOTES

1"National Congress Resolves to Improve First Amendment Education for Youth." The Newspaper Fund Newsletter, March-April 1980, p. 3.

2"Awareness of the Constitution." Editor and Publisher. March 7, 1987, p. 10.

3Craig Crawford, "Poll Finds Confusion About Key Elements of the Constitution," The Philadelphia Inquirer, February 15, 1987, p. 34A.

4"Promoting Awareness of the Constitution," Editor and Publisher, February 28, 1987, p. 26.

5"Nation's Schools Will Join 'Celebration of Citizenship,'" Presstime, March 1987, p. 58.

6Marvin Lazerson, Judith Block McLaughlin, Bruce McPherson and Stephen K. Bailey. An Education of Value: The Purposes and Practices of Schools, pp. xi, xvi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1985.

7Ibid., p.61.

8Patricia O'Brien, "An Alarming Trend in the High Schools," The Philadelphia Inquirer, December 18, 1981, p. 23A.

9Stanley M. Elam, "Anti-American Attitudes of High School Seniors in the Orwell Year," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1984, p. 331.

10Thomas Eveslage, "A Proposed Press Law and Responsibilities Teaching Unit for Secondary Schools." A paper presented to the Secondary Education Division of AEJMC, August 1981, East Lansing, Mich.

11Roberta Sigel, "Students' Comprehension of Democracy and Its Application to Conflict Situations." International Journal of Political Education, 1979, pp. 47-65.

12Ruth Jones, "Changes in the Political Orientations of American Youth: 1969-1975," Youth and Society, 1976, pp. 335-339.

13National Assessment of Educational Progress. Citizenship and Social Studies Achievement of Young Americans: 1981-82 Performances and Changes Between 1976 and 1982. Denver: Education Commission of the States. 1983.

14Lloyd Johnston and Jerald Bachman. Monitoring the Future: Questionnaire Responses from the Nation's High School Seniors. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center. 1980.

15Elam., op. cit.

16Eveslage, op. cit., p. 5.

17Lee Ehman, "Research on Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction: Values." In Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970-1975, F.P. Hunkins et. al., eds. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies. 1977.

18Richard Remy and Lonnie Wagstaff, "Principals Can Exert a Leadership Role in Citizenship Education," NASSP Bulletin, May 1982, p. 56.

19Wayne Herman, Jr., "What Should Be Taught Where?" Social Education, February 1983, pp. 94-100.

20"In Search of a Scope and Sequence for Social Studies." Report of the National Council for the Social Studies' Task Force on Scope and Sequence, November 1983, in Social Education, April 1984, pp. 250-259, 262.

21Francis Hunkins, Lee Ehman, Carole Hahn, Peter Martorella and Jan Tucker. Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970-1975. Boulder, Colo: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education. 1977, p. 89.

22Gail Zellman and David Sears, "Childhood Origins of Tolerance for Dissent," Journal of Social Issues, pp. 109-136, 1971.

23George Levenson, "The School's Contribution to the Learning of Participatory Responsibility," in Political Youth, Traditional Schools: National and International Perspectives, Byron Massialas, ed., pp. 123-148. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1972.

24Dan Lortie. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. 1975.

25Elam, op. cit., p. 331.

26"In Search of a Scope and Sequence for Social Studies," op. cit., pp. 256-257.

27Charles Kniker. You and Values Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publ. Co. 1977, p. 33

28John Goodlad, "The Problem of Getting Markedly Better Schools," pp. 59-78 in Bad Times, Good Schools, Jack Frymier, ed. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi. 1983, p. 65.

29"In Search of a Scope and Sequence for Social Studies," op. cit., pp.253,262.

30Kniker, op. cit., p. 33.

31Dennis Goldenson, "An Alternative View About the Role of the Secondary School in Political Socialization: A Field-Experimental Study of the Development of Civil Liberties Attitudes." Theory and Research in Social Education, 1978, pp. 44-72.

32David Grossman, "Educational Climates and Attitudes Toward Dissent: A Study of Political Socialization of Conflict Norms in Adolescents. A paper presented at the 1974 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Chicago.

33"In Search of a Scope and Sequence for Social Studies," op. cit., p. 257.

34Lee Ehman, "The American School in the Political Socialization Process," Review of Educational Research, Spring 1980, p. 113.

35Goodlad, op. cit., pp. 68, 69.

36Hunkins et. al., op. cit., p. 89.

37Remy and Wagstaff, op. cit., p. 56.

38James Shaver, O.L. Davis and Suzanne Helburn, "The Status of Social Studies Education: Impressions from Three NSF Studies," Social Education, February 1979, p. 151.

39John Patrick and Richard Remy, "The Development of Lessons on the Constitution," The Social Studies, January/February 1985, p. 10.

40Eveslage, op. cit., p. 6.

41Eugene Gilliom, Richard Remy and Robert Woyach, "Using the Local Community as a Resource for Global Education." Teaching Political Science, April 1980, pp. 251-164.

42Mary Jane Turner, "Treatment of the Constitution in School-Based Non-Traditional Programs," in Teaching About the Constitution in American Secondary Schools. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association. 1981, p. 139.